## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 40 and 67 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Fornsel in view of Babko-Malyi. Additionally, Claims 68-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Fornsel in view of Babko-Malyi and the newly cited U.S. patent 5,319,186 (Lenhardt); dependent Claim 47 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Fornsel in view of Babko-Malyi, Lenhardt and Tanaka et al.

Applicants wish to thank examiner Alanko for the courtesy of an interview on October 5, 2010 at which time the Office Action was discussed. In particular, Applicants argued that Claim 67 is directed to a method of removing a coating from an area of a substrate by controlling the orientation of a slit shaped plasma nozzle, relative to the direction of movement, during relative movement of the substrate and nozzle. None of the cited prior art conveys the idea of controlling the area of removal by setting the orientation of a slit shaped plasma nozzle relative to the direction of movement. Claims 68-69 respectively recite reorienting a row of nozzles at a corner, or reorienting the slit shaped nozzle at a corner, to control the width of plasma removal at two edges of the substrate. Col. 4 of Lenhardt describes that a nozzle applying a sealant to the edge of a sheet should be rotated at the corner. However, this is simply done to keep the nozzle pointed to the edge to be sealed. It does not control the area of coating.

It was the position of the examiner during the interview that the rejected claims did not adequately limit the invention to distinguish over this prior art. On the other hand, it was agreed that the claims, if amended in accordance with the present response to recite adjusting a slit shaped nozzle, or a row of nozzles, from one orientation to another orientation would adequately limit the invention to distinguish over this prior art.

Application No. 10/561,008 Reply to Office Action of September 2, 2010

Applicants therefore believe that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicit an early notice of allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUŞTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$ 

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/07) RTP/rac

Robert T. Pous Attorney of Record

Registration No. 29,099